

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Pecen et al.)
)
For: Method for Rapid Uplink Access)
by GSM GPRS/EDGE Mobile)
Stations Engaged in Voice Over)
Internet Protocol Packet Transfer)
Mode)
Serial No.: 09/599,355)
)
Filed: June 21, 2000)
)
Examiner: Torres, M.)
)
Art Unit: 2687)

Interview Summary

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Further to the telephone interviews conducted between July 5, 2006 and July 6, 2006, between the Examiner's Supervisor, George Eng and the applicants' representative, Lawrence Chapa, which was initiated by the applicant, the applicants' representative hereby presents a summary of the discussion.

During the discussion, the issuance of an Advisory Action in response to a Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief Review Request was discussed with George Eng. During the discussion, the grounds for the Advisory Action were noted as being factually incorrect. More specifically, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner, Marcos Torres, alleged that the applicants had attempted to file an amendment at the same time as the Notice of Appeal and the Pre-Appeal Brief Review Request, and therefore the Examiner further alleged that the Pre-Appeal Brief Review Request was defective. During the interview with George Eng, the applicants clarified that the attached copy of a response was not a new response, but represented a courtesy copy of a

previously submitted response, as set forth in the Pre-Appeal Brief Review Request, in order to verify the nature of amendments made in a previously submitted response. The copy of the prior amendment was submitted to correct the misunderstanding, which served as the basis for the Examiner's objections under 35 USC §112.

As part of the final discussion with George Eng, which took place on July 6, 2006, the Examiner confirmed that the issuance of the Advisory Action was improper and would be withdrawn. He further suggested that the objections under 35 USC §112 were expected to be withdrawn, and that the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review would be considered. It was further confirmed that presently no further action on the part of the applicants was necessary for the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review to take place, based upon the current documentation on file. Multiple conversations took place between July 5, 2006, and July 6, 2006, between the Examiner's Supervisor, George Eng, and the applicants' representative, Lawrence Chapa, in order to introduce the issues and give the Examiner's Supervisor an opportunity to review the file, and then report the Examiner's Supervisor's conclusions, as noted above.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: /Lawrence Chapa/

Lawrence J. Chapa

Reg. No. 39,135

Phone (847) 523-0340

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Mobile Devices
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, W4 35Q
Libertyville, IL 60048